

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 580

UD 015 408

TITLE Racial and Ethnic Survey '74-'75.
INSTITUTION Oregon State Dept. of Education, Salem. Compensatory Education Section.
PUB DATE 1 Jun 75
NOTE 55p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS American Indians; Anti Segregation Programs; Asian Americans; Bilingual Education; Demography; Disadvantaged Youth; *Ethnic Distribution; Federal Programs; Negro Students; Racial Composition; *Racial Distribution; Racial Integration; *School Personnel; Spanish Americans; *State Surveys; *Student Enrollment

IDENTIFIERS Civil Rights Act 1964 Title IV; Lau v Nichols; *Oregon; Prime Model; Program Research in Multicultural Education Model; Russians

ABSTRACT

This document, presenting a statewide racial and ethnic survey by determining the distribution and composition of student enrollments and school personnel in local districts, is said to represent the most comprehensive effort attempted by Oregon's Title IV Unit, whose purpose is said to lie in improving the quality of services to target clients, and in encouraging districts to adopt and implement comprehensive integration programs. A section on equal educational opportunity and perspectives provides information on desegregation, integration and the law, state authority, and the state education department's responsibility. Also listed in this section are the components and objectives of the Program Research in Multi-Cultural Education Model (PRIME Model), which is said to have been developed to eliminate racial isolation. The survey data is presented in seven tables that are subsequently summarized. A statement on Lau et al vs. Nichols, in which a precedent for assistance to cultural and linguistically different children was established, is made in reference to Oregon school districts with a significant enrollment of culturally different students. Three districts are currently operating bilingual education programs. Maps, along with county totals, grade totals, school district totals, and personnel totals, are provided. (Author/AM)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

RACIAL & ETHNIC SURVEY '74-'75

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DIVISION OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT

Leonard Kunzman, Associate Superintendent

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION SECTION

Gilbert Anzaldúa, Director

Ron T. Halfmoon, Coordinator, Title IV CRA

John F. Heflin, Specialist, Title IV CRA

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Verne A. Duncan

Superintendent of Public Instruction

942 Lancaster Drive NE

Salem, Oregon 97310

1 500 197 536 743

2/3

08501103

805-510 (DN)

FOREWORD

Since 1969, the State Title IV unit has conducted racial and ethnic surveys to determine the distribution and composition of student enrollments and school personnel in local districts. Once again, school districts responded in a timely manner and cooperated fully with this important task.

This is the fifth racial and ethnic survey and the most comprehensive effort to present the racial composition of student and staffing patterns. The first step in attempting to improve equal education, is to identify our clients and then target special services to meet those critical educational needs.

Thank you for your cooperation and attention to this report.

Verne A. Duncan
Superintendent
of Public Instruction



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STATE OF OREGON

942 LANCASTER DRIVE NE
SALEM, OREGON 97310

• Information (503) 378-3569

June 1, 1975

From its inception, the State Intergroup Human Relations Commission has worked in conjunction with the Oregon Department of Education to convey the educational needs expressed by community groups, to improve the quality of services for minority students, and to encourage districts to adopt and implement comprehensive integration programs.

In carrying out its responsibilities, the Commission has supported and worked with the Title IV staff in conducting the racial and ethnic surveys in Oregon. We fully recognize the need to identify youngsters in order to target educational services to meet their needs.

Ellis H. Casson
Chairman
State Intergroup Human Relations
Commission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	iii
Letter from Chairman of Commission	v
Introduction	ix
Equal Educational Opportunity: A Perspective	1
Desegregation, Integration And The Law	3
State Authority	4
Oregon Department of Education Responsibility	4
Survey Data	7
A Statement on Lau	13
Summary of Racial and Ethnic Survey Data	15
Maps	19
County Totals	25
Grade Totals	27
School District Totals	29
Personnel Totals	41

INTRODUCTION

During the past two decades educators and social scientists have devoted considerable attention to equalizing educational opportunity and the outcomes of formal schooling. Numerous studies have focused on the social-psychological, educational and economic effects of racial isolation in schools, whether *de jure* or *de facto*. The studies have brought about justifications and proposals for eliminating racial isolation.

This report is fifth in the series compiled by the Oregon Department of Education. Its objective is to document the racial and ethnic distribution of pupils and employees in Oregon public education agencies.

In the fall of 1974, a statewide survey was conducted by the Department of Education. All Oregon school districts provided data concerning pupil distribution in each school, as well as staff distribution in 115 districts (73% of the schools) and various intermediate education districts. Most of the data was required for the Elementary and Secondary Civil Rights Survey which is conducted annually by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare—Office for Civil Rights. Additional data, required for administrative purposes by the Department, was collected simultaneously. This report, compiled by the Title IV unit of the Compensatory Education Section, is based on data from the statewide survey.

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY: A PERSPECTIVE

The concept of equal educational opportunity abounds in American educational literature. However, difficulty often arises as educators (theorists, program developers and practitioners) attempt to operationalize the concept. Considerable discussion is often generated over the mere definition of the concept and the selection of indicators. But in recent years several nationally recognized social scientists and educators have worked to provide a clearer and more contemporary definition of the educational equality concept.

This section will focus on the development and rationale of contemporary equal educational opportunity themes and the relationship of the concept to current Oregon Department of Education—Title IV Civil Rights Act activities.

Social theorist André Beteille suggests that social inequality, conceptually, has two basic dimensions—distributive and relational. The first dimension refers to the ways societal resources (income, wealth, occupation, education, power, prestige or other valued goods) are distributed in the population. The second refers to the ways which individuals, differentiated by the above resources, relate to each other within a social system. This approach seems straightforward. However, when applied specifically to education, new considerations arise.

A recent U.S. Senate inquiry, lasting almost three years, sought to place the equality concept within the context of education. The Senate passed Senate Resolution 359 (91st Congress)

on February 19, 1970, which reads as follows:

"Whereas the policy of the United States to assure every child, regardless of color or national origin, an equal opportunity for quality education has not been achieved in any section of the Country: Now, therefore be it *Resolved* that a committee be established to study the effectiveness of existing laws and policies in assuring equality of educational opportunity, including policies of the United States with regard to segregation on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, whatever the origin or cause of such segregation and to examine the extent to which policies are applied in all regions of the United States."

The U.S. Senate Select Committee created by Resolution 359 consisted of the following members:

Walter F. Mondale, Minn., Chairman
John L. McClellan, Arkansas
Warren G. Magnuson, Washington
Jennings Randolph, West Virginia
Daniel Inouye, Hawaii
Birch Bayh, Indiana
William G. Spong, Jr., Virginia
Sam J. Ervin, Jr., North Carolina
Adlai E. Stevenson III, Illinois
Roman Hruska, Nebraska
Peter Dominick, Colorado
Edward W. Brooke, Mass.
Clark O. Hatfield, Oregon
Marlow W. Cook, Kentucky
Jacob K. Javits, New York

This U.S. Senate Select Committee listened to students, teachers, parents, school administrators, social scientists, academic experts, foundation officers and government officials during its inquiry into the way in which

"American public education serves those voices who are heard least—children and families from racial and ethnic minority groups, or who are simply poor."

Among the first to be called before the Committee to set the scope of the inquiry were Dr. Kenneth Clark, a professor of social-psychology at the City University of New York and Director of the Metropolitan Applied Research Center; Dr. James Coleman, professor of social relations at the Johns-Hopkins University and principal investigator of the massive survey of American schools authorized by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (this survey is often referred to as the Coleman Report); and Dr. Thomas F. Pettigrew, a career scholar in the field of race relations and a professor of social relations at Harvard University.

Dr. Clark, who provided much of the social science evidence for the NAACP attorneys who argued the *Brown vs. Topeka* case, reiterated that:

"To separate them [Blacks] from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely to ever be undone."

Dr. Clark added that the brief submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court also contained a section which focused upon the consequences of dual school systems for majority group children. According to Dr. Clark:

"The culture permits and at times encourages them [Whites] to direct their feelings of hostility and aggression against whole groups of people, the members of which are perceived as weaker than themselves. They often develop patterns of guilt feelings, rationalizations and other mechanisms which they must use to protect themselves from recognizing the essential injustice of their unrealistic fears and hatreds for the minority groups."

Clearly, Dr. Clark's line of testimony before the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954 and before the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity defines equal educational opportunity in terms of the elimination of dual school systems and/or racial isolation. It was this line of social-psychological and legal testimony which was very basic to United States Supreme Court's decision in *Brown* which declared governmentally enforced school segregation to be in

violation of the 14th Amendment and that separate educational facilities were inherently unequal.

Dr. James Coleman reviewed the concept of equal educational opportunity in the public education histories of the United States, Canada and England. Two of his basic approaches to a definition of the concept can be summarized as follows:

- That opportunity consists of free and open access to the same school resources for all children.
- That weight is given to each of the qualities of the vector—such weight to be determined by an estimate of the effect of a resource upon educational achievement.

This second approach focuses upon relatively new dimensions of equality because it considers the intensity of resources needed for effectiveness in schooling. Using the measures of school quality (number of school administrators, per pupil expenditure for teaching, teacher preparation, teacher test performance, pupil-teacher ratio, age of building, size of library, and backgrounds of fellow students), Coleman sought to determine what resources really make a difference. One of his most significant conclusions was that the integration of a lower class child into a predominantly middle class school does more than anything else to narrow the gap in achievement as measured by achievement test scores. And, correspondingly, social class integration is usually impossible for minority students without racial integration.

A third expert witness, Dr. Thomas Pettigrew, stated that in his opinion one of the essential

components of equal educational opportunity for the United States is the racial and social class integration of the nation's public schools... "social science evidence leads to that conclusion."

Thus, each of these nationally recognized expert witnesses generally agreed on the importance of eliminating racial segregation and/or isolation, whatever its causes, as being fundamental to providing equal educational opportunity in American schools.

1.0 Desegregation, Integration And The Law

The thrust toward school desegregation and equalizing educational opportunity in Oregon comes from several sources—federal law, court decisions and Oregon State Board of Education policy.

Both federal and state court decisions have their root in the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States... nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court ruled in the far-reaching *Brown vs. Topeka* decision, that *de jure* segregation is illegal. The implication of this decision is summarized in a report to the United States Commission on Civil Rights:

"Later decisions have applied *Brown* to purposeful school segregation re-

sulting from administrative actions of state or local public officials even where such segregation is not dictated or sanctioned by the state or local law. The courts have indicated that such purposeful segregation is unconstitutional even where it is less than complete and even when it is accomplished by inaction rather than action."

The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provided for the implementation of many civil rights statutes, including school desegregation. Title VI authorized the Justice Department to file suits against public educational organizations which were not in compliance with the law. With respect to school desegregation policy, Title IV of the Act authorized the U.S. Office of Education to provide financial assistance to LEAs to enable them to overcome the problems incident to desegregation. Also included was a provision providing technical assistance to states and school districts in various stages of the desegregation process.

The Title VI provision empowered the U.S. Justice Department to take the initiative; this often resulted in the courts directing a school district to develop and submit a satisfactory plan which then became a part of a detailed court order over which the court retained jurisdiction.

2.0 State Authority

To insure that Oregon school districts meet their responsibility toward equal education opportunities, on March 22, 1974, the State Board of Education adopted Policy

Number 4171 which has the following provisions:

"The Board of Education considering its goals of modern education, the scholastic needs of students, and its responsibility to equalize educational opportunities, hereby declares its policy to encourage and support racially integrated education in the elementary and secondary schools of Oregon so that children of all races learn together and acquire the skills and attributes of citizenship. The Board of Education declares that it is the affirmative duty of each local school district which has a substantial racial minority student enrollment to formulate policies, and to plan, implement, and evaluate educationally sound and feasible programs, to prevent or eliminate racial isolation in its schools, and to achieve and maintain an integrated educational program characterized by mutual respect, awareness of cultural diversity, and responsiveness to the needs of all students. The Superintendent of Public Instruction is hereby directed to request local school districts to report to him periodically concerning their policies, plans, and programs, and shall provide assistance to local districts, to achieve these goals."

3.0 Oregon Department of Education Responsibility

The Department's concern for the elimination of racial isolation is a function of the Title IV Civil Rights Act unit, also referred to as the Equal Educational Opportunities unit. This unit, part of the Compensatory Education Section of the Oregon

Department of Education, was first organized in 1969. Under its current work plan the following major objectives have been incorporated:

- To render assistance to school districts and other agencies concerning problems attendant to desegregation and integration.
- To provide technical assistance in field services to LEAs and education related agencies.
- To provide for communications and interagency liaison.
- To act as a resource in curriculum development and in-service training.

The Title IV CRA unit recognizes that the elimination of racial isolation is the first step in achieving racial, ethnic and social integration in Oregon public schools. The following objectives are components of the PRIME Model.* They should be pursued simultaneously with the objectives listed above, in order to build multi-racial educational environments.

- **Multi-ethnic Student Roles.** Students of all ethnic groups should become structurally integrated in the social system of the school so they hold comparable statuses and play comparable roles in the school. Specifically, this means the children of all ethnic groups come to perceive each other as friends and that the distribution of valued statuses and roles in the school is similar for all groups.

- **Multi-ethnic Educator Roles.** Integration of educators of all ethnic groups throughout the staff of the school so that opportunity structure is equally open to educators of all groups. This implies that educators from all ethnic groups will be recruited and will hold statuses and roles at all levels of the school hierarchy.

- **Multi-ethnic Parent Roles.** Parents of children of all ethnic groups shall become structurally integrated into the life of the school so that they hold comparable statuses and roles at all levels of the hierarchy.

- **Self-concept and Attitudes** toward school and learning shall become equally positive in students of all ethnic groups.

- **Academic Achievement** of students from all ethnic groups will match and exceed the national norms for standardized achievement tests.

- **Multi-ethnic Programs** shall be developed in which curriculum materials, teacher attitudes, and teaching procedures provide all children with opportunities to understand and to develop pride in their own ethnic heritages, in order to understand and respect the ethnic heritages of other groups in the classroom and American society.

*PRIME Model: Program Research in Multi-Cultural Education, University of California at Riverside, Riverside, CA.

In summary, the elements of educational inequality—racial and linguistic isolation, economic discrimination, malnutrition, unequal resources and unequal school practices—add up to a complex system which is short-changing many minority children. Solutions to the problems outlined in the foregoing section are not simple. But the Oregon Department of Education Title IV unit is moving ahead in an affirmative manner to meet the challenges of equalizing education for Oregon children.

SURVEY DATA

TABLE I

Shows overall totals of racial minority students in Oregon schools since school year 1969-70. While total enrollment has been increasing the proportion of one minority group to another has not changed significantly.

TABLE II

Compares the overall totals of racial minority students in the state to the corresponding racial minority students in grade 12.

TABLE III

Compares the number of minority and Anglo educators in the state. This information shows a pattern of growth but is slightly misleading since a substantial number of these persons may well be employed on "soft" money (federal programs), either as aides or noncertificated personnel.

TABLE IV

The 1974-75 data shows an additional facet to the pattern of minority administrators by delineating male and female personnel and their ethnicity.

TABLE V

Shows the school districts which have "substantial racial minority student enrollment." Five percent (5%) or more of the total student

enrollment in all schools of these districts are Black, Native American, Mexican-American, or Asian-American. According to the *Guidelines for Prevention, Reduction and Elimination of Racial Imbalance in Public Schools*, these school districts will be required to submit prevention plans.

TABLE VI

Shows schools where racial isolation exists. The appropriate school district is required to submit a plan for the elimination of racial isolation.

TABLE VII

Shows schools which have a racial minority student enrollment which is approaching a condition of racial isolation. The appropriate school district will be required to submit a prevention plan.

Staffing patterns have been included within Tables V, VI, and VII to show the proportion of racial minority student enrollments to racial minority staffing. The presence of a significant number of racial minority students in the school district is indicative of a corresponding number of racial minority persons within the community. This information is useful as a measure of the district's affirmative action plan as well as an indication of the presence or absence of role models for the minority students. "Personnel Totals" shown on page 41 is a further indicator of the disparity which exists statewide.

TABLE I
RACIAL AND ETHNIC GROUPS IN OREGON SCHOOLS
 Enrollment patterns for statewide totals from 1969-1975

	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75
Spanish-surname	4,500	6,682	6,573			7,979
Black	7,513	8,003	7,997			8,864
American Indian	3,385	3,627	3,563	No Survey		4,602
Oriental	3,130	3,266	2,778			3,577
Russian	210	518	518			503
Anglo	408,192	442,854	448,020			448,446

TABLE II
RACIAL AND ETHNIC GROUPS IN OREGON SCHOOLS
 Comparison of K-12 to Grade 12

	Spanish Surname	Black	American Indian	Oriental	Russian	Anglo
1971-72						
K-12	6,573	7,997	3,567	2,778	518	448,020
Grade 12	316	420	173	255	13	32,315
1974-75						
K-12	7,979	8,864	4,602	3,577	503	448,446
Grade 12	405	517	246	277	3	32,318

TABLE III
 Local School District Personnel

	Spanish Surname	Black	American Indian	Oriental	Russian	Anglo
1968-69	15	137	16	97	—	21,031
1969-70	30	137	31	95	2	23,031
1970-71	165	176	72	157	3	32,959
1971-72	157	160	101	111	14	39,445
1974-75	215	400	88	195	*	32,740

*There is no category for "Russian" on the EEO-5 FORMS

TABLE IV
Minority School District Administrators

1970-71

1—Spanish-surnamed principal
4—Black principals
3—Black vice principals
2—Indian principals
2—Oriental vice principals

1971-72

1—Spanish-surnamed superintendent
1—Spanish-surnamed vice principal
4—Black principals
2—Black vice principals
2—Indian principals
2—Oriental vice principals

1974-75

OFFICIALS, ADMINISTRATORS AND MANAGERS

MALE				FEMALE			
Black	Spanish-Surname	Oriental	Indian	Black	Spanish-Surname	Oriental	Indian
7	2	0	2	4	0	0	0

PRINCIPALS

MALE				FEMALE			
Black	Spanish-Surname	Oriental	Indian	Black	Spanish-Surname	Oriental	Indian
1	2	0	2	2	0	1	0

ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS
(Teaching & Non-Teaching)

MALE				FEMALE			
Black	Spanish-Surname	Oriental	Indian	Black	Spanish-Surname	Oriental	Indian
2	1	5	2	5	0	0	0

TABLE V
SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH "SUBSTANTIAL RACIAL MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENTS"

	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities	Total Enrollment	Combined % Minority Students
Ninety-One 91 (Clackamas Co.)	340	6	—	—	5	53	—	404	15.8
Coos Bay 9 (Coos County)	5,560	51	7	31	488	5	45	6,187	10.1
Culver 4 (Jefferson Co.)	308	30	—	—	2	—	—	340	9.4
Jefferson 509J (Jefferson Co.)	1,598	65	10	3	693	—	7	2,373	32.7
Klamath Co. School Dist. (Klamath Co.)	6,579	139	60	45	397	1	13	7,234	9.0
Adrian 61 (Malheur Co.)	341	49	—	21	—	—	—	411	17.0
Ontario 8C (Malheur Co.)	2,127	406	22	131	3	—	23	2,712	21.6
Nyssa 26 (Malheur Co.)	685	555	15	20	2	—	1	1,278	46.4
Vale 15 (Malheur Co.)	533	103	—	7	6	—	3	652	18.3
Vale U.H. 3 (Malheur Co.)	378	22	—	5	—	—	—	405	6.7
Gervais U.H. 1 (Marion Co.)	323	55	—	—	—	—	—	378	14.6
Jefferson 14J (Marion Co.)	778	99	11	4	—	—	—	896	13.2
Mt. Angel 91 (Marion Co.)	592	101	—	1	—	39	1	734	19.3
North Marion 15 (Marion Co.)	1,241	200	—	—	—	—	—	1,441	13.9
Woodburn 103C (Marion Co.)	1,429	392	4	13	5	247	8	2,098	31.9
Portland 1J (Multnomah Co.)	53,394	758	7,490	1,119	522	—	30	63,313	15.7
Central 13J (Polk Co.)	2,115	261	21	15	15	—	10	2,437	13.2
Athena 29R (Umatilla Co.)	310	—	—	—	34	—	2	346	10.4
Pendleton 16R (Umatilla Co.)	3,424	22	18	17	215	—	2	3,698	7.4
Umatilla 6R (Umatilla Co.)	406	36	—	5	6	—	1	454	10.6
Forest Grove 15 (Washington Co.)	3,655	259	5	6	5	—	—	3,930	7.0
Dayton 8 (Yamhill Co.)	842	111	—	2	1	—	3	959	12.2
McMinnville 40 (Yamhill Co.)	2,928	161	17 ⁴	22	5	—	1	3,121	6.2
Willamina 30J (Yamhill Co.)	854	9	2	5	84	—	1	955	10.6

STAFFING PATTERNS
(Administration & Certified Staff Only)

S"

Total ollment	Combined % Of Minority Students
404	15.8
3,187	10.1
340	9.4
2,376	32.7
7,234	9.0
411	17.0
2,712	21.6
1,278	46.4
652	18.3
405	6.7
378	14.6
896	13.2
734	19.3
1,441	13.9
2,098	31.9
3,313	15.7
2,437	13.2
346	10.4
1,698	7.4
454	10.6
1,930	7.0
959	12.2
1,121	6.2
955	10.6

White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Other Minorities	Total (Admin. & Cert. Staff)	Combined % Of Minority Staff
*22	—	—	—	—	—	22	—
355	—	—	5	5	—	365	2.7
NOT INCLUDED IN '74 OR '75 EEO-5 SURVEY							
128	—	—	1	6	—	135	5.2
418	1	—	1	1	—	421	.7
*24	—	—	2	—	—	26	7.7
132	5	—	6	—	—	143	7.7
66	2	—	1	—	—	69	4.3
31	—	—	2	—	—	33	5.1
NOT INCLUDED IN '74 OR '75 EEO-5 SURVEY							
29	1	—	—	1	—	31	6.5
50	1	—	1	1	—	53	5.7
NOT INCLUDED IN '74 OR '75 EEO-5 SURVEY							
*65	1	—	1	—	—	67	3.0
119	14	—	1	—	—	134	11.2
3,181	15	212	48	4	4	3,464	8.2
124	1	—	—	—	1	126	1.6
*24	1	—	—	—	—	25	4.0
200	1	1	—	—	—	202	1.0
29	—	—	—	—	—	29	—
185	4	—	1	1	1	192	3.6
*50	2	—	1	1	—	54	7.4
159	1	—	1	—	—	161	1.2
62	—	—	—	—	—	62	—

TABLE VI
SCHOOLS WHICH ARE "RACIALLY ISOLATED"

	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Combined % Of Other Minorities	Total Enrollment	Minority Students
Simnasho Elementary (Jefferson 509J)	4	—	—	—	22	—	—	26	84
Warm Springs Elementary (Jefferson 509J)	12	—	—	1	346	—	—	359	90
Nyssa Elementary (Nyssa S. D. 26)	291	347	8	6	—	—	—	652	55
Boise (Portland 1J)	29	1	264	1	1	—	—	296	90
Eliot Elementary (Portland 1J)	125	1	246	—	1	—	—	373	60
Humboldt Elementary (Portland 1J)	88	13	187	1	—	—	—	289	60
Irvington Elementary (Portland 1J)	256	8	287	3	—	—	—	554	53
King Elementary (Portland 1J)	26	5	507	3	5	—	—	546	90
Sabin Elementary (Portland 1J)	142	2	238	1	2	—	—	385	60
Vernon Elementary (Portland 1J)	219	8	369	4	9	—	10	619	64

TABLE VII
SCHOOLS NEARING "RACIAL ISOLATION"

	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities	Combined % Of Total Enrollment	Minority Students
Lindbergh Elem. (Ontario 8C)	97	82	7	4	—	—	1	191	4
Nyssa Jr. High (Nyssa 26)	122	100	1	4	2	—	—	229	4
Nellie Muir Elementary (Woodburn 103)	214	170	2	1	—	3	—	390	4
Washington Elementary (Woodburn 103)	181	7	—	2	—	161	—	351	4
Woodlawn Elementary (Portland S.D. 1J)	332	7	258	6	2	—	—	605	4
Jefferson H.S. (Portland 1J)	509	14	420	6	9	—	—	958	4

TABLE VI
H ARE "RACIALLY ISOLATED" AND STAFFING PATTERNS

	Total Enrollment	Minority Students	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Other Minorities	Total (Admin. & Cert. Staff)	Combined % Of Minority Staff
	26	84.6	28	—	—	—	2	—	30	6.7
359	96.7									
652	55.4	34	1	—	1	—	—	—	36	5.6
296	90.2	20	—	4	—	—	—	—	24	16.7
373	66.5	13	—	4	2	—	—	—	19	31.6
289	69.6	13	—	6	—	—	—	—	19	31.6
554	53.8	22	—	5	—	—	—	1	28	21.4
546	95.2	28	—	10	—	—	—	—	38	26.31
385	63.1	19	—	10	—	—	—	—	30	36.7
619	64.6	23	—	11	—	—	—	—	34	32.4

TABLE VII
ARING "RACIAL ISOLATION" AND STAFFING PATTERNS

Combined % Of Total Enrollment	Minority Students	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Other Minorities	Total (Admin. & Cert. Staff)	Combined % Of Minority Staff
191	49.2	11	1	—	—	—	—	12	8.3
229	46.7	9	—	—	—	—	—	9	—
390	45.1	13	8	—	—	—	—	21	38.1
351	48.4	23	—	—	—	—	—	23	—
605	45.1	28	—	4	1	—	—	33	15.2
958	40.9	65	—	10	2	—	—	77	15.6

A STATEMENT ON LAU

A memorandum issued by the Director of the Office for Civil Rights on May 25, 1970, established some ground rules for school districts in determining compliance with Title VI in the provision of equal educational opportunity. The memo was addressed to "School Districts With More Than Five Per Cent National Origin-Minority Group Children." Unfortunately not all districts have seen or had the opportunity to study this important memo. But a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court on January 21, 1974, in the case of *Lau et al vs. Nichols et al* served notice that those rules were still in effect and that

"The Department (HEW) has reasonably and consistently interpreted Section 601 to require affirmative remedial efforts to give special attention to linguistically deprived children."

Section 601 of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Departmental regulations (45CFR Part 80) clearly establish the role of HEW in determining compliance in the provision of schools for equal educational opportunity. With the opinions rendered in *Lau*, a precedent was established that school districts can no longer refuse to give any assistance to the culturally and linguistically different child and that a district which determines to teach only English clearly violates the intent of Title VI, which is in fact an affirmative act of discrimination.

The case for bilingual/bicultural education has been strengthened in several other recent court

decisions for which *Lau* was the landmark. The following court decisions will no doubt encourage the further development of equality bilingual/bicultural programs:

Aspira vs. Board of Education of the City of New York

Serna vs. Portales Municipal Schools, and
Keyes vs. School District Number 1

Obviously the role of the courts in educational changes has become dramatic, and reaffirms the notion that the traditional system has not met the educational needs of the culturally and linguistically different students.

Following the *Lau* case, HEW has taken several steps to determine the implications of that Supreme Court decision:

- The Office of Civil Rights has undertaken a survey of over 300 districts throughout the United States to determine compliance to *Lau*.
- A "task force whose membership includes bilingual experts..." has been created to discuss the problem areas and make recommendations for appropriate guidelines and models for the Office of Civil Rights regarding *Lau* compliance.

While Oregon schools, excluding Portland, have not been included in the OCR *Lau* survey, 17 districts with more than 950 students have a significant enrollment of culturally different students. More often than not these districts will

be obligated to seriously consider the implications of *Lau* in the delivery of their services.

Three districts in Oregon currently operate bilingual education programs. They have received grants funded under Title VII, ESEA and serve either an all-Spanish or a Spanish and Russian population. No grants are being awarded for any Indian language program. Approximately 1,000 students are presently being served in these programs. The current proposed rules and regulations under the Bilingual Education Act define "limited English speaking ability," when used with reference to an individual, to mean individuals who were not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English and who came from environments where a language other than English is dominant. Under a strict inter-

pretation of the Bilingual Education Act the person who is bicultural but speaks monolingually in English is not eligible for assistance. The net effect of this is to rule out federal assistance for the many Indian communities within the state.

In summary, *Lau* will undoubtedly have tremendous implications for the millions of bilingual students now in the public school systems. School districts will be required to take a critical look at the present options being offered to their respective students and assess their relevance to equal educational opportunity, particularly in terms of bilingual/bicultural education. The courts have served notice that they will, if necessary, fashion the relief if the districts or school boards continue to be reluctant.

SUMMARY OF RACIAL AND ETHNIC SURVEY DATA

1.0 STUDENTS

- 1.1 The enrollment patterns for all minority groups over a five year period have stabilized.
- 1.2 The proportion of Black students attending racially imbalanced schools has *not* changed. These students are still attending segregated schools.
- 1.3 Mexican-American and Indian students are also attending schools where cultural and linguistic isolation exists.
- 1.4 Twenty-four districts have at least 5% or more minority student enrollment.
- 1.5 Ten schools in the state are "racially isolated." Seven of these schools are in Portland.
- 1.6 5.6% (or 26,533) of Oregon school pupils are from culturally different backgrounds.
- 1.7 Five schools within given school districts are nearing racial isolation.

2.0 STAFFING PATTERNS

- 2.1 The number of minority administrators remains alarmingly low when compared to the percentage of minority students

throughout the state.

- 2.2 Those school districts with significant impactation of minority students have a disproportionately low number of minority staff.
- 2.3 While minority students comprise 5.6% of the total student enrollment, only 2.9% of school staffs are minority group people.
- 2.4 Schools which are racially isolated have a low percentage of minority staff members.
- 2.5 Any significant increases in minority staffing patterns also reflect the employment of instructional aides, and quasi-administrative positions on federal funds.

3.0 SUMMARY


The recently adopted state policy on racial imbalance will have a profound effect on a number of school districts. Racially imbalanced schools still exist and at this point are the greatest barrier to progress toward desegregation and integrated education. If the minority student is to have equal educational opportunity, then the first step is complete desegregation.









1-1
101-5
501-1,0
1,001-5,0
5,001-10,0

1974-1975**TOTAL SPANISH SURNAME ENROLLMENT:**

MAPS

SPANISH SURNAME ENROLLMENT BY COUNTY

1974-1975




TOTAL SPANISH SURNAME ENROLLMENT: 7,979

19

1-1
101-5
501-1,0
1,001-5,0
5,001-10,0



1-1
101-5
501-1,0
1,001-5,0
5,001-10,0



1-1
101-5
501-1,0
1,001-5,0
5,001-10,0

1-1
101-5
501-1,0
1,001-5,0
5,001-10,0

1974-1975




TOTAL BLACK ENROLLMENT: 8,864

1-10
101-50
501-1,00
1,001-5,00
5,001-10,00

ORIENTAL ENROLLMENT BY COUNTY

1974-1975



TOTAL ORIENTAL ENROLLMENT:



33

31

32

ORIENTAL ENROLLMENT BY COUNTY


1974-1975



TOTAL ORIENTAL ENROLLMENT: 3,577 21

INDIAN ENROLLMENT BY COUNTY

1974-1975



22



33

TOTAL INDIAN ENROLLMENT: 4,634

34

INDIAN ENROLLMENT BY COUNTY



1974-1975



TOTAL INDIAN ENROLLMENT: 4,602


RUSSIAN ENROLLMENT BY COUNTY

1974-1975





1-
101-
501-1,
1,001-5,
5,001-10,

5,001-10,000



"OTHER MINORITIES" ENROLLMENT BY COUNTY

1974-1975



COUNTY TOTALS

SURVEY COMPLETED APRIL 1975 - County Totals

IED/County	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities
Baker	3,328	22	10	7	17	—	1
Benton	10,179	92	48	123	30	4	27
Clackamas	46,162	402	150	244	230	70	116
Clatsop	4,881	34	3	54	27	—	20
Columbia	8,347	26	6	20	23	1	24
Coos	13,164	89	23	58	568	5	65
Crook	2,501	32	1	5	33	—	6
Curry	3,200	10	1	11	40	—	9
Deschutes	8,936	89	9	30	35	3	14
Douglas	18,557	179	19	74	125	2	20
Gilliam	428	17	—	—	10	—	—
Grant	1,635	10	—	—	5	—	2
Harney	1,724	16	—	10	52	—	14
Hood River	2,989	86	13	85	20	1	6
Jackson	23,068	270	13	116	127	5	44
Jefferson	1,919	95	10	4	895	—	7
Josephine	9,370	100	12	44	61	—	21
Klamath	10,689	246	110	61	529	1	34
Lake	1,553	13	1	3	13	—	3
Lane	47,473	399	273	270	238	14	166
Lincoln	4,942	15	9	15	125	—	9
Linn	18,045	232	19	64	100	1	26
Malheur	4,470	1,162	37	198	11	—	27
Marion	32,845	1,677	167	127	134	393	60
Morrow	1,252	32	—	6	6	—	—
Multnomah	86,277	984	7,713	1,526	647	2	137
Polk	5,172	282	25	23	38	—	15
Sherman	462	2	—	1	1	—	—
Tillamook	3,614	26	7	20	20	—	4
Umatilla	9,673	221	37	41	342	—	7
Union	4,745	34	18	18	23	—	10
Wallowa	1,399	3	—	1	1	—	—
Wasco	4,225	21	20	25	78	—	8
Washington	40,425	699	98	247	71	1	94
Wheeler	452	2	—	—	—	—	—
Wamhill	10,345	361	12	46	127	—	12
Grand Total	448,446	7,979	8,864	3,577	4,602	503	1,008

GRADE TOTALS

SURVEY COMPLETED APRIL 1975 GRADE TOTALS								
Grade	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities	Total
Pre-Primary	420	46	297	4	17	—	—	784
Kindergarten	16,059	364	496	211	192	2	39	17,363
1	33,160	714	669	311	350	88	101	35,393
2	32,053	683	671	253	248	100	99	34,207
3	32,165	639	651	281	360	66	81	34,243
4	33,121	741	649	258	434	71	111	35,385
5	35,060	756	714	308	465	77	68	37,448
6	36,917	711	665	296	470	34	103	39,196
7	39,473	678	707	255	344	27	79	41,563
8	39,802	651	689	280	426	12	97	41,957
Unclass.-Elem.	2,633	55	96	16	44	—	9	2,852
9	39,931	594	732	290	333	10	68	41,958
10	38,290	502	685	238	293	6	50	40,064
11	36,091	416	599	297	270	7	39	37,719
12	32,318	405	517	277	246	3	59	33,825
Unclass.-Secun.	953	24	28	2	10	—	5	1,022
Grand Total	448,446	7,979	8,864	3,577	4,602	503	1,008	474,979

SCHOOL DISTRICT TOTALS

SURVEY COMPLETED APRIL 1975
School District Totals

County and Districts	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities
BAKER							
Baker 5J	2,561	18	10	6	14	—	—
Huntington 16J	149	—	—	—	1	—	—
Hereford-Unity	136	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pine Eagle 61	482	4	—	1	2	—	1
BENTON							
Alpine 26	72	1	—	—	1	—	—
Alsea 7J	236	3	—	2	—	—	—
Bellfountain 23	64	—	—	—	—	—	—
Corvallis 509J	7,452	76	46	108	27	4	26
Fairmount 43	172	—	—	2	—	—	—
Fir Grove 74	161	—	—	1	—	—	—
Irish Bend 24	31	—	—	—	—	—	—
Monroe 25J	189	4	1	2	—	—	—
Monroe UH1J	190	2	—	—	—	—	—
No. Albany 34	180	—	—	—	—	—	—
Oak Grove 4	214	1	—	1	—	—	—
Philomath 17J	1218	5	1	7	2	—	1
CLACKAMAS							
Boring 44	497	3	1	2	1	—	—
Bull Run 45	69	—	—	—	—	—	—
Butte Creek 67J	182	8	4	—	2	6	—
Canby 86	1,558	49	3	3	1	—	—
Canby UH1	1,006	24	—	2	1	3	—
Carus 29	227	4	1	—	1	2	—
Clarkes 32	208	—	—	—	—	—	—
Colton 53	794	12	5	1	3	—	1
Cottrell 107	232	—	—	—	3	—	1
Damascus-Union 26	803	2	2	1	4	—	—
Dickey Prairie 25	53	—	—	—	—	—	—
Estacada 108	1,522	3	1	—	46	1	2
Estacada UH6	1,041	2	1	—	2	—	4
Gladstone 115	1,724	6	6	16	8	—	4
Lake Oswego 7J	6,586	46	52	51	8	3	16
Maple Grove 87	28	—	—	—	—	—	—
Molalla 35	997	27	—	5	3	—	—

School District Totals
(Continued)

County and Districts	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities
Molalla UH4	932	10	2	—	1	—	—
Mulino 84	322	2	—	1	3	—	—
Ninety One 91	340	6	—	—	5	53	—
No. Clackamas 12	14,500	87	36	102	72	1	50
Oregon City 62	6,127	62	14	39	34	—	19
Redland 116	581	2	1	—	—	—	—
Rural Dell 92	149	—	1	1	—	—	—
Sandy 46	1,282	14	4	1	2	1	14
Sandy UH2	1,036	2	—	2	6	—	—
Shubel 80	60	—	3	—	—	—	—
Three Lynx 123	61	—	—	—	—	—	—
Welches 13	285	4	—	2	1	—	4
West Inn 3J	2,960	27	13	15	23	—	1
CLATSOP							
Astoria 1	2,185	16	3	42	12	—	18
Jewell 8	101	1	—	—	—	—	—
Lewis & Clark 5	395	3	—	4	—	—	—
Olney 11	45	—	—	—	—	—	—
Seaside 10	1,506	4	—	7	14	—	1
Warrenton 30	649	10	—	1	1	—	1
COLUMBIA							
Columbia 5J	1,828	8	—	7	8	—	3
Rainier 13J	1,450	3	—	4	4	1	2
Scappoose 1J	1,747	4	5	4	4	—	1
St. Helens 502	2,616	4	1	4	6	—	18
Vernonia 47J	706	6	—	1	1	—	—
COOS							
Bandon 54	892	—	—	4	4	—	1
Coos Bay 9	5,560	51	7	31	488	5	45
Coquille 8	1,885	4	—	9	11	—	9
Myrtle Point 41	1,220	4	—	—	23	—	—
North Bend 13	3,441	30	16	12	30	—	10
Powers 31	166	—	—	2	12	—	—
CROOK							
Crook County Unit	2,501	32	1	5	33	—	6

School District Totals
(Continued)

County and Districts	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities
CURRY							
Agness 4	17	—	—	1	—	—	—
Brookings-Harbor 17	1,471	3	—	4	—	—	8
Gold Beach 3	554	7	1	2	19	—	1
Gold Beach UH1	316	—	—	1	7	—	—
Ophir 12	94	—	—	—	5	—	—
Pistol River 16	22	—	—	—	—	—	—
Port Orford-Langois 2J	697	—	—	3	5	—	—
Upper Chetco 23	29	—	—	—	4	—	—
DESCHUTES							
Bend 1	5,640	52	9	21	14	3	13
Brothers 15	7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Redmond 2J	3,118	37	—	9	18	—	1
Sisters 6	171	—	—	—	3	—	—
DOUGLAS							
Ash Valley 125	27	4	—	—	—	—	—
Camas Valley 21	189	3	—	—	7	—	1
Days Creek 15	270	12	—	—	2	—	4
Elkton 34	276	2	—	—	—	—	—
Glendale 77	579	13	—	1	4	—	2
Glide 12	1,097	2	7	—	6	—	—
N. Douglas 22	574	5	6	—	3	—	—
Oakland 1	626	2	—	4	—	—	—
Reedsport 105	1,419	3	—	16	17	—	1
Riddle 70	636	9	—	1	—	—	—
Roseburg 4	6,648	63	4	43	31	2	6
South Umpqua 19	2,241	32	—	5	27	—	—
Sutherlin 130	1,516	15	—	1	15	—	1
Umpqua 45	56	—	—	1	—	—	3
Winston-Dillard 116	2,008	7	2	2	9	—	2
Yoncalla 32	395	7	—	—	6	—	—
GILLIAM							
Arlington 3	127	8	—	—	3	—	—
Condon 25J	286	9	—	—	7	—	—
Olex 11	15	—	—	—	—	—	—

School District Totals
(Continued)

County and Districts	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities
GRANT							
Dayville 16J	83	—	—	—	—	—	—
John Day 3	870	5	—	—	5	—	2
Long Creek 17	112	—	—	—	—	—	—
Monument 8	106	3	—	—	—	—	—
Mt. Vernon 6	143	2	—	—	—	—	—
Prairie City 4	321	—	—	—	—	—	—
HARNEY							
Andrews 29	13	—	—	—	—	—	—
Burns 1	737	14	—	7	36	—	8
Burns UH2	498	1	—	2	12	—	6
Crane 4	52	—	—	—	—	—	—
Crane UH1J	91	—	—	—	2	—	—
Diamond 7	16	—	—	—	—	—	—
Double O 28	3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Drewsey 13	14	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fields 33	11	—	—	—	—	—	—
Frenchglen 16	11	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hines 30	238	1	—	—	2	—	—
Lawen 18	15	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pine Creek 5	10	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sodhouse 32	7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Suntex 10	8	—	—	1	—	—	—
Trout Creek 53	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
HOOD RIVER							
Hood River 1	2,989	86	13	85	20	1	6
JACKSON							
Applegate 40	126	—	—	—	5	—	—
Ashland 5	2,944	26	2	19	10	—	5
Butte Falls 91	237	6	—	—	—	—	—
Central Point 6	4,226	53	2	13	22	5	2
Eagle Point 9	2,720	45	3	14	21	—	16
Medford 549	9,446	96	6	45	31	—	14
Phoenix 4	1,952	20	—	16	22	—	2
Pinehurst 94	15	—	—	—	—	—	—
Prospect 59	238	—	—	—	—	—	—

School District Totals
(Continued)

County and Districts	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities
Rogue River 35	1,164	24	—	9	16	—	5
JEFFERSON							
Ashwood 8	6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Black Butte 41	7	—	—	1	—	—	—
Culver 4	308	30	—	—	2	—	—
Jefferson 509J	1,598	65	10	3	693	—	7
JOSEPHINE							
County Unit	4,450	64	7	13	44	—	2
Grants Pass 7	4,920	36	5	31	17	—	19
KLAMATH							
Klamath County	6,579	139	60	45	397	1	13
Klamath Falls 1	2,011	66	25	9	81	—	5
Klamath Falls UH2	2,099	41	25	7	51	—	16
LAKE							
Adel 21	25	—	1	—	—	—	—
Fort Rock 24	46	—	—	—	3	—	—
Lakeview 7	1,206	11	—	3	10	—	3
Paisley 11	144	—	—	—	—	—	—
Plush 18	6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Silver Lake 14	73	—	—	—	—	—	—
Union 5	53	2	—	—	—	—	—
LANE							
Bethel 52	3,341	40	13	21	22	—	12
Blachly 90	169	—	3	—	—	—	—
Creswell 40	974	3	—	4	2	—	6
Crow-Applegate 66	508	—	—	2	5	—	—
Eugene 4J	20,358	169	220	176	101	6	115
Fern Ridge 28J	1,823	16	2	5	14	—	2
Junction City 69	1,701	16	2	5	8	—	1
Lowell 71	455	7	—	—	—	—	—
Mapleton 32	450	4	—	2	—	—	—
Marcola 79	306	—	1	—	2	—	1
McKenzie 68	421	13	2	3	—	—	3
Oakridge 76	1,068	22	2	4	4	—	4
Pleasant Hill	1,345	2	4	6	3	1	5
Siuslaw 97J	1,381	—	—	—	3	—	—

School District Totals
(Continued)

County and Districts	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities
South Lane 45J	3,500	19	—	11	4	—	2
Springfield 19	9,673	88	24	31	70	7	15
LINCOLN							
Lincoln Co. Unit	4,942	15	9	15	125	—	9
LINN							
Albany 5	2,231	34	4	9	6	—	9
Albany UH8J	4,026	49	—	18	27	—	2
Central Linn 552	987	9	1	2	2	—	1
Clover Ridge 136	168	8	—	—	—	—	—
Crabtree 110	62	—	—	—	—	—	—
Crowfoot 89	715	10	4	2	2	—	3
Denny 78	26	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dever 20	30	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gore 81	63	—	—	1	—	—	—
Grand Prairie 14	328	4	1	5	2	—	—
Griggs 4	43	—	—	2	—	—	—
Hamilton Creek 33	241	—	—	—	—	—	—
Harris 46	32	—	—	—	—	—	—
Harrisburg 42J	409	6	2	—	2	—	—
Harrisburg UH 5J	217	3	2	1	1	—	—
Knox Butte 19	104	4	—	—	4	—	—
Lacomb 73	240	3	—	—	—	—	—
Lakeview 114	39	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lebanon 16	1,546	19	—	6	13	—	3
Lebanon UH1	1,521	11	1	6	5	—	3
Lourdes 124	34	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mari-Linn 29J	190	1	—	—	7	—	—
McFarland 25	89	2	—	1	—	—	—
Mill City 129J	571	12	—	2	2	—	1
Millersburg 32	121	4	—	—	—	—	—
Oak Creek 15	31	—	—	—	—	—	—
Oakville 36	28	—	—	—	—	—	—
Price 6	79	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sodaville 13	73	—	—	—	—	—	—
Riverside 24	80	3	—	—	1	—	2
Sandridge 30	61	—	3	—	—	—	—

School District Totals
(Continued)

County and Districts	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities
Scio 95	766	9	—	6	5	1	—
Sweet Home 55	2,643	38	1	3	21	—	2
Tangent 26	79	2	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee 102	111	1	—	—	—	—	—
Wyatt 63J	61	—	—	—	—	—	—
MALHEUR							
Adrian 61	341	49	—	21	—	—	—
Annex 29	79	23	—	10	—	—	—
Arock 81	25	—	—	—	—	—	—
Brogan 1	14	—	—	—	—	—	—
Harper 66	86	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jordan Valley 3	47	—	—	1	—	—	—
Jordan Valley UH1	51	—	—	—	—	—	—
Juntura 12	22	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nyssa 26	685	555	15	20	2	—	1
Ontario 8	2,127	406	22	131	3	—	23
Rockville 2	5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vale 15	533	103	—	7	6	—	—
Vale UH3	378	22	—	5	—	—	—
Willowcreek 42	77	4	—	3	—	—	—
MARION							
Aumsville 11	534	5	1	—	—	—	—
Bethany 63	79	3	—	—	—	—	—
Brooks 31	134	7	—	—	—	—	—
Buena Crest 134	50	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cascade UH5	1,157	26	—	3	—	1	—
Central Howell 540	105	—	—	—	2	—	—
Cloverdale 144	84	—	—	—	2	—	—
Detroit 123J	162	—	—	—	—	—	—
Eldriedge 60	77	13	—	—	—	5	—
Evergreen 10	47	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gervais 76	133	87	—	2	—	28	—
Gervais UH1	323	55	—	—	—	—	—
Jefferson 14J	778	99	11	4	4	—	—
Marion 20	97	—	—	—	—	—	—
Monitor 142J	116	20	—	2	—	48	—

**School District Totals
(Continued)**

County and Districts	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities
Mt. Angel 91	592	101	—	1	—	39	1
North-Howell 51	38	7	—	—	—	—	—
North Marion 15	1,241	200	—	—	—	—	—
North Santiam 126	83	7	—	—	—	—	—
Parkersville 82	19	—	—	—	—	18	—
Pioneer 13	42	6	—	—	—	—	—
Pratum 50	43	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Paul 45	149	81	1	—	—	—	—
Salem 24J	21,172	466	149	88	104	5	50
Scotts Mills 73J	149	11	—	—	—	—	—
Silver Crest 93	136	3	—	—	—	—	—
Silverton 4	1,026	35	—	1	4	2	—
Silverton UH7J	944	20	—	3	2	—	—
Stayton 77J	671	19	—	6	9	—	—
Stayton UH4J	572	3	1	3	2	—	1
Sublimity 7	208	1	—	—	—	—	—
Turner 79	229	—	—	1	—	—	—
Victor Point 42	134	1	—	—	—	—	—
West Stayton 61	92	9	—	—	—	—	—
Woodburn 103	1,429	392	4	13	5	247	8
MORROW							
Morrow	1,252	32	—	6	6	—	—
MULTNOMAH							
Bonneville 46	44	1	—	—	—	—	—
Corbett 39	628	10	3	3	9	—	7
David Douglas 40	7,850	64	54	138	51	2	23
Gresham 4	3,439	10	20	31	11	—	15
Gresham UH2J	5,183	16	25	56	5	—	4
Lynch 28	3,454	25	15	21	22	—	21
Orient 6J	688	2	2	8	3	—	1
Parkrose 3	5,003	27	64	85	8	—	13
Pleasant Valley 15J	365	2	2	—	—	—	—
Portland 1J	53,394	758	7,490	1,119	522	—	30
Reynolds 7	3,701	33	21	42	6	—	16
Riverdale 51J	209	—	—	5	—	—	1
Rockwood 27	2,233	36	17	16	9	—	6

**School District Totals
(Continued)**

County and Districts	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities
Sauvies Island 19	86	—	—	2	1	—	—
POLK							
Central 13J	2,115	261	21	15	15	—	10
Dallas 2	2,558	15	7	7	22	—	5
Falls City 57	211	—	—	—	—	—	—
Perrydale 21	130	—	—	1	—	—	—
Valsetz 62	158	6	—	—	1	—	—
SHERMAN							
Grass Valley 23	54	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kent 9J	38	—	—	—	1	—	—
Moro 17	86	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rufus 3	51	—	—	1	—	—	—
Sherman UH1	145	2	—	—	—	—	—
Wasco 7	88	—	—	—	—	—	—
TILLAMOOK							
Beaver 8	140	2	—	1	4	—	—
Cloverdale 22	196	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hebo 13J	84	—	5	—	1	—	—
Neah-Kah-Nie 56	959	6	—	7	5	—	—
Nestucca UHS 3	248	—	1	3	2	—	—
Tillamook 9	1,987	18	1	9	8	—	4
UMATILLA							
Athena 29	310	—	—	—	34	—	2
Echo 5	211	2	—	—	—	—	—
Ferndale 10	248	4	—	—	—	—	—
Helix 1	97	—	—	—	2	—	—
Hermiston 8	2,312	94	10	10	47	—	—
Milton Freewater 31	735	27	3	3	5	—	2
Milton Freewater UH3	479	13	1	2	—	—	—
Pendleton 16	3,424	22	18	17	215	—	2
Pilot Rock 2	565	9	—	—	22	—	—
Stanfield 61	373	9	—	—	2	—	—
Tum-A-Lum 4	67	—	4	—	—	—	—
Ukiah 80	105	—	—	—	—	—	—
Umapine 13	86	5	—	—	2	—	—
Umatilla 6	406	36	—	5	6	—	1

**School District Totals
(Continued)**

County and Districts	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities
Weston 19	255	—	1	4	7	—	—
UNION							
Cove 15	244	1	—	2	—	—	5
Elgin 23	573	6	—	3	10	—	1
Imbler 11	328	1	—	3	1	—	—
LaGrande 1	2,891	21	18	6	6	—	4
North Powder 8J	183	—	—	—	—	—	—
Union 5	526	5	—	4	6	—	—
WALLOWA							
Enterprise 21	637	—	—	—	—	—	—
Flora 32	4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Joseph 6	331	—	—	—	1	—	—
Troy 54	8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wallowa 12	419	3	—	1	—	—	—
WASCO							
Antelope 50J	5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chenowith 9	1,031	1	2	4	29	—	5
Dufur 29	221	—	—	1	—	—	—
Maupin 84	135	6	—	2	4	—	—
Maupin UH1	106	—	—	—	6	—	—
Petersburg 14	100	—	—	1	9	—	—
The Dalles 12	2,490	14	18	17	21	—	3
Tygh Valley 40	79	—	—	—	8	—	—
Wamic 42	58	—	—	—	1	—	—
WASHINGTON							
Banks 13	915	6	—	—	3	—	2
Beaverton 48J	19,770	103	67	167	25	—	68
Farmington View 58J	200	5	—	1	—	—	—
Forest Grove 15	3,655	259	5	6	5	—	—
Gaston 511J	500	25	—	4	—	—	—
Groner 39	257	13	—	2	6	—	—
Hillsboro 7	2,703	117	2	22	8	—	10
Hillsboro UH3J	4,226	128	5	6	1	—	6
North Plains 70	318	9	—	—	6	—	—
Reedville 29	893	11	1	7	1	—	3
Sherwood 88J	1,239	9	2	4	1	—	—

**School District Totals
(Continued)**

County and Districts	White	Spanish Surname	Black	Oriental	American Indian	Russian	Other Minorities
Tigard 23J	5,444	14	16	28	15	1	5
West Union 1	305	—	—	—	—	—	—
WHEELER							
Fossil 21	299	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mitchell 55	91	2	—	—	—	—	—
Spray 1	62	—	—	—	—	—	—
YAMHILL							
Amity 4J	592	25	—	2	3	—	3
Carlton 11	306	7	—	—	—	—	—
Dayton 8	842	111	—	2	1	—	3
McMinnville 40	2,928	161	4	22	5	—	1
Newberg 29J	3,186	40	—	5	10	—	3
Sheridan 48J	768	8	3	5	24	—	1
Willamina 30J	854	9	2	5	84	—	1
Yamhill 16	468	—	3	5	—	—	—
Yamhill-Carlton UH1	401	—	—	—	—	—	—
Grand Totals	448,446	7,979	8,864	3,577	4,602	503	1,008

PERSONNEL TOTALS

A. FULL-TIME STAFF

ACTIVITY ASSIGNMENT CLASSIFICATION	STAFF TOTALS											
	MALE						FEMALE					
	WHITE	BLACK	SPANISH SURNAME AMERICAN	ASIAN AMERICAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER	WHITE	BLACK	SPANISH SURNAME AMERICAN	ASIAN AMERICAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER
Officials, Adminis- trators, Manager	410	7	2	—	2	—	64	4	—	—	—	—
Principals	782	1	2	—	2	3	47	2	—	1	—	—
Assistant Princi- pals, Teaching	58	1	—	—	—	1	7	—	—	—	—	—
Assistant Princi- pals, Nonteaching	264	1	1	5	2	—	38	5	—	—	—	—
Elementary Class- room Teachers	2,262	19	9	20	12	—	6,714	92	19	55	13	10
Secondary Class- room teachers	5,564	24	33	31	12	9	3,151	14	15	28	7	3
Other Class- room Teachers	278	4	3	3	1	—	485	5	5	8	1	1
Guidance	399	6	1	5	3	1	343	8	3	2	2	—
Psychological	22	—	—	—	—	1	17	—	1	—	—	—
Librarians/Audio- visual Staff	125	—	1	—	—	1	603	3	2	2	1	—
Consultants & Super- visors of Instruction	155	1	1	—	1	—	92	5	4	1	—	—
Other Profes- sional Staff	242	15	2	3	1	—	424	19	2	3	3	—
Teacher Aides	77	12	4	1	2	—	1,647	92	49	9	11	5
Technicians	84	1	—	—	—	1	88	1	1	1	—	—
Clerical/Sec- retarial Staff	43	2	—	—	—	—	2,421	19	12	5	5	3
Service Workers	2,738	22	22	6	4	4	1,985	13	9	5	3	2
Skilled Crafts	724	1	6	1	—	1	71	—	2	—	—	—
Laborers, Unskilled	252	1	2	—	—	—	64	—	2	—	—	—
TOTAL	14,479	118	89	75	42	22	18,261	282	126	120	46	24

*Based on 11.5 sample districts

PERSONNEL TOTALS

A. FULL-TIME STAFF

	STAFF TOTALS												OVERALL TOTALS (SUM OF COL. A THRU L)
	MALE						FEMALE						
	WHITE	BLACK	SPANISH SURNAME AMERICAN	ASIAN AMERICAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER	WHITE	BLACK	SPANISH SURNAME AMERICAN	ASIAN AMERICAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER	
	410	7	2	—	2	—	64	4	—	—	—	—	489
	782	1	2	—	2	3	47	2	—	1	—	—	840
	58	1	—	—	—	1	7	—	—	—	—	—	67
	264	1	1	5	2	—	38	5	—	—	—	—	316
	2,262	19	9	20	12	—	6,714	92	19	55	13	10	9,225
	5,564	24	33	31	12	9	3,151	14	15	28	7	3	8,891
	278	4	3	3	1	—	485	5	5	8	1	1	794
	399	6	1	5	3	1	343	8	3	2	2	—	773
	22	—	—	—	—	1	17	—	1	—	—	—	41
	125	—	1	—	—	1	603	3	2	2	1	—	738
per- son	155	1	1	—	1	—	92	5	4	1	—	—	260
	242	15	2	3	1	—	424	19	2	3	3	—	714
	77	12	4	1	2	—	1,647	92	49	9	11	5	1,909
	84	1	—	—	—	1	88	1	1	1	—	—	177
	43	2	—	—	—	—	2,421	19	12	5	5	3	2,510
	2,738	22	22	6	4	4	1,985	13	9	5	3	2	4,813
	724	1	6	1	—	1	71	—	2	—	—	—	806
d	252	1	2	—	—	—	64	—	2	—	—	—	321
	14,479	118	89	75	42	22	18,261	282	126	120	46	24	33,684

B. PART-TIME STAFF

ACTIVITY ASSIGNMENT CLASSIFICATION	STAFF TOTALS											
	MALE						FEMALE					
	WHITE	BLACK	SPANISH SURNAME AMERICAN	ASIAN AMERICAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER	WHITE	BLACK	SPANISH SURNAME AMERICAN	ASIAN AMERICAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER
Professional Instructional	496	5	—	6	2	—	1,109	4	5	11	3	—
All Other	782	19	12	3	1	—	3,342	55	12	11	21	—
TOTAL	1,278	24	12	9	3	—	4,451	59	17	22	24	—

C. NEW HIRES (7/1/74 - 10/1/74)

Officials, Administrators, Managers	32	1	—	—	—	—	3	1	—	—	1	—
Principals/Asst. Principals	63	—	—	1	—	—	9	3	—	—	—	—
Classroom Teachers	969	9	4	4	4	1	1,543	29	8	19	2	4
Other Professional Staff	141	3	4	1	3	—	227	7	12	2	1	—
Nonprofessional Staff	467	20	6	2	1	—	1,173	44	24	6	8	2
TOTAL	1,672	33	14	8	8	1	2,955	84	44	27	12	6

B. PART-TIME STAFF

LOCATION	STAFF TOTALS												OVERALL TOTALS (SUM OF COL. A THRU L)
	MALE						FEMALE						
	WHITE	BLACK	SPANISH SURNAME AMERICAN	ASIAN AMERICAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER	WHITE	BLACK	SPANISH SURNAME AMERICAN	ASIAN AMERICAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER	
	496	5	—	6	2	—	1,109	4	5	11	3	1	1,642
	782	19	12	3	1	—	3,342	55	12	11	21	1	4,259
	1,278	24	12	9	3	—	4,451	59	17	22	24	2	5,901

C. NEW HIRES (7/1/74 - 10/1/74)

n- gers	32	1	—	—	—	—	3	1	—	—	1	—	38
chers	63	—	—	1	—	—	9	3	—	—	—	—	76
	969	9	4	4	4	1	1,543	29	8	19	2	4	2,596
	141	3	4	1	3	—	227	7	12	2	1	—	401
	467	20	6	2	1	—	1,173	44	24	6	8	2	1,753
	1,672	33	14	8	8	1	2,955	84	44	27	12	6	4,864